

71.5.2  
A Vo

Deliv

2 Thess.  
ready work

We a  
shaking  
integrity  
and gre  
agitation  
vince to  
our Don  
keen an  
are sket  
graphic  
iv., whic  
it is the  
expound  
6 : " I  
brance e  
minister  
the word  
question  
the Be  
rising n  
patrioti  
and his  
the fut  
or othe  
mystery  
opens u  
even ha  
ly has)  
from a  
the pro  
within  
such a  
" good  
more is  
ticular  
has or  
too, is  
politic  
on bot  
posed t  
view o  
remnat  
ly divid



# A Voice from Nova Scotia on the Jesuit Question.

## A DISCOURSE

Delivered in Fort Massey Church, Halifax, N. S.  
Sabbath Evening, 31st March, 1889.

BY REV. R. F. BURNS, D. D.

2 Thess. II, 7: "The mystery of iniquity doth already work."

We are finding it so to our cost. It is shaking our land. It is threatening the integrity and independence of our large and great Dominion. It has originated an agitation that has stirred our Banner province to its depths, and made the floor of our Dominion Parliament the arena of a keen and protracted struggle. Its features are sketched here, or yet more minutely and graphically in a parallel passage in 1 Tim. iv., which we ought to study, and which it is the faithful pastor's bounden duty to expound. Paul brings out therein at verse 6: "If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine." The questions involved are essential, if not to the Being at least to the well-being of our rising nation. They appeal to the piety and patriotism of every lover of his country and his God among us. They will tell on the future of our land and the prosperity or otherwise of all our churches. The mystery of iniquity which already works, opens up a field of absorbing investigation, even had it nothing to do (as it undoubtedly has) with our truest interests. So far from a subject of this kind lying outside the province of the pulpit, it comes directly within it. Faithful witness-bearing on such a theme, is one prominent mark of a "good minister of Jesus Christ." All the more is it our duty in this case as the particular phase of the general question which has originated so much talk, and temper too, is entirely clear of the field of party politics the vast majority of the politicians on both sides, being for the present, opposed to what we conceive to be the right view of the question and a very small remnant, with party allegiance about equally divided holding thereunto. Truth has al-

ways been in a minority, but 'one with God is' a majority," any day. The vote at Ottawa is very far indeed from settling the struggle. It is but begun. The great question, with whose origin we presume you are acquainted, will doubtless be laid at the foot of the throne, and in its constitutional aspects submitted to Privy council adjudication. In so far as we citizens are concerned; this is freedom's battle, and

"Freedom's battle once begun  
Bequeath'd from bleeding sire to son,  
Though baffled oft, is ever won."

Passing over all preliminary matter and coming at once to the subject in hand, we object to the

### JESUIT ESTATES' ACT,

In the first place, because it involves a virtual *mal-administration of trust*. There can be no question that generous, unsuspecting Britain, at the time of the conquest of Canada, allowed her newly acquired subjects, a latitude of privilege not usual on the part of the conquerors to the conquered—a latitude which has been too often taken advantage of to our detriment, brought the machinery of government almost to a standstill or deadlock, and imperilled the existence of the union between Upper and Lower Canada, and latterly of that Confederation to which many looked as likely to supply the way of escape. On this account the position has been reversed, and time and again the conquerors have had to plead for their rights in presence of and by appeal to the conquered. Still, easy-going and from an overweening courtesy and generosity, ready to make all manner of concessions, though Britain was, she granted no more privileges to the Roman Catholics than British law sanctioned. The act of capitulation abrogated any special privileges, and destroyed any titles to proper-

ties which the Jesuits may previously have had, for it brings out that "the Roman Catholic" church was to be recognized in Canada only "in so far as the laws of Britain recognized it,"—an arrangement which the "act of Montreal" granting certain rights of property to the Jesuits, could not alter. The general act takes precedence of any local ones. But, even supposing that any authority attached to this last, it ceased with the existence of the order.

In 1761 the Society of Jesus was suppressed in France, and its property devoted by royal authority to educational purposes.

#### JESUITS SUPPRESSED.

Thirteen years thereafter (in 1774) the royal instructions to the Governor-General of Canada directed that "the society of the Jesuits should be suppressed and dissolved, and no longer continue a body corporate and politic, and that all their rights, privileges and property should be vested in the crown." The year before 1773 by papal authority the society had been suppressed. While in 1774 the local laws of Canada were restored. Religious orders were expressly excepted. No special privileges were allowed to the Jesuits. They were subject to British, not to French law. Consequently the act of incorporation, granted them two years since, was utterly *ultra vires* the Quebec legislature because it contravenes that British law under whose operation in such matters at the conquest Quebec came. Jesuits cannot be incorporated in Britain, and therefore cannot in Canada. The Jesuit property reverted to the crown, and it was expressly stipulated that it should be appropriated for educational uses throughout the province as a whole without any reserve. Repeatedly, for example, in 1800, 1812 and 1825, the Lower Canada legislative assembly earnestly petitioned in favour of carrying out this arrangement, but was balked by the intervention of the Roman Catholic authorities.

#### FOR EDUCATION ONLY.

These petitions mention expressly that "the Estates of that (the Jesuit) order were originally granted by the king of France for the purpose of educating the natives of the country," and that "the Jesuits were merely depositaries thereof for the purposes of the education of the youth of the province."

The petition of 1825 prays that the said Estates might be devoted "according to their primitive destination for the education of the youth of this country," and be placed at the disposal of the legislature for that purpose.

On the 7th July, 1831, a despatch was addressed by the then colonial secretary, Earl Goderich to the governor at Quebec representing His Majesty William IV., urging strongly that "the Jesuit Estates were, on the dissolution of that order, appropriated to the education of the people,"

and further, "that the revenue which might result from that property should be regarded as inviolably and exclusively applicable to the object"—and moreover "that the king cheerfully and without reserve confided the duty of the application of those funds for the purposes of education to provincial legislation."

Let it be clearly understood, then, that the province of Quebec had no peculiar rights depending on any treaty with France—that Canada was ceded to Great Britain in the most ample manner and form without restriction. The king of Great Britain agreed to "grant the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada, and gave orders that "his new Roman Catholic subjects may profess the worship of their religion according to the rites of the Romish church as far as the laws of Britain permit." The act of Parliament afterwards passed (14 George iii. chap. 83) grants just the same powers subject to the king's supremacy as are embodied in an act passed in the first year of Queen Elizabeth. The Jesuits were never recognized in any form. It thus appears plain beyond dispute, quoting as we have done from the original documents.

1. That what are commonly known as the Jesuit Estates were entrusted to that society not absolutely, but as a deposit for the good of the country, educationally and without any exclusive ecclesiastical reference.

2. That, in virtue of the suppression of the Jesuits first by papal, and then by royal decree, these Estates were removed entirely from Jesuit control, and reverted to the civil authorities, or, in the language of the Canadian enactment declaring their suppression that, hence forward all their "rights, privileges and property should be vested in the crown." Consequently,

3. It is a *mal-administration* of Trust, for the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec, in the face of its own repeated action in anti-confederation times, to abjure its own right to custodianship, by giving up said consecrated property, or any portion of it, or funds out of the public purse, by way of commutation in lieu of it, to a society that was abolished by its own chief, and by our own King, and for purposes, alien from its original destination. Be it remembered, too, that the amount in question is appropriated but in part, (and that the smallest part), to its supposed owners, that others got the larger portion who have no claim to it, and that the appropriation is made not for the province as a whole, and for educational purposes therein in particular, but for whatever uses, or objects the Pope may choose to prescribe. This last consideration introduces an element at variance with British precedent and prestige, which makes the measure, not merely a virtual breach of trust, but a violation of the British Constitution. This brings us to our second point.

II. The measure is

inasmuch  
subject to  
or reject  
the licen  
Potentat  
President  
there is n  
would no  
the term  
fi d it in

The pr  
responde  
of Quebe  
Pope. I  
Estates  
their tra  
The first  
Premier  
Secretar  
Vatican,  
a letter c  
Tascher  
"reserv  
the que  
Canada.

The Q  
if he wo  
of the p  
would le  
a specia  
after, in  
be enter  
ed, with

Thus  
Papal P  
the latt  
that we  
authorit  
celled a  
had. T  
iously k  
week's  
who qu  
tion Ac  
denomi  
been al  
their p  
the cro  
law, an  
putably  
individ  
undoul  
to put  
mon fu  
is not f

Whe  
of Que  
to disp  
previo  
How g  
from  
"The  
retain  
Jesuit  
dispos  
of th  
The  
are in  
in th  
curate

## UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

inasmuch as it makes British Legislation subject to the surveillance—the approval or rejection of a Foreign Power. Were the license it grants to this Ecclesiastical Potentate to be vested in the American President or any European Sovereign, there is no true Briton amongst us, who would not resent and resist it. What are the terms of the Jesuit Estates' Act as we find it in the Quebec Statutes for 1883.

The preamble to the bill contains the correspondence between the civil authorities of Quebec and the representatives of the Pope. It records the confiscation of the Estates by His Majesty George III., and their transfer to the Province of Canada. The first letter of the correspondence from Premier Mercier is to the Pope's official Secretary, the Prime Minister of the Vatican, Cardinal Simeon, quoting from a letter of the latter in 1887 to Cardinal Taschereau to the effect that the Pope had "reserved to himself the right of settling the question of the Jesuits' Estates in Canada."

The Quebec Premier asks His Eminence if he would have no objections to the sale of the property, adding "the Government would look upon the proceeds of the sale, as a special deposit to be disposed of hereafter, in accordance with the agreement to be entered into between the parties interested, with the SANCTION OF THE HOLY SEE."

Thus the Provincial asks the leave of the Papal Premier, to dispose of lands on which the latter has no claim whatever—lands that were confiscated by the constituted authorities, and whose confiscation cancelled any claim they may have previously had. This radical difference was dexteriously kept out of sight by those in this week's debate in the Dominion Parliament, who quoted the Clergy Reserve Commutation Act of 1854 as a parallel case. The denominations included under it had not been abolished as this order was, nor had their property undergone confiscation to the crown. They were acknowledged by law, and the property involved was indisputably theirs. They commuted on their individual claims whose legitimacy was undoubted, and agreed among themselves, to put the amount so realized into a common fund. Between the two cases, there is not the slightest resemblance.

What right or necessity had the Province of Quebec to solicit liberty from the Pope to dispose of lands which, over a century previously had reverted to the crown? How grating to British ears this telegram from Rome, granting the leave asked. "THE POPE ALLOWS the Government to retain the proceeds of the sale of the Jesuits' Estates as a special deposit, to be disposed of hereafter, WITH THE SANCTION OF THE HOLY SEE."

The "Fathers of the Society of Jesus," are instructed from headquarters, to treat in their own name (through their Procurator), with the Civil Government, in

such a manner however, as to leave full liberty to the Holy See, to dispose of the property AS IT DEEMS ADVISABLE, and consequently that they should be very careful that no condition or clause be inserted in the official deed of the concession of such property, which could in any MATTER AFFECT THE LIBERTY OF THE HOLY SEE. What conceivable lien, legal, moral or equitable, could the "Holy See" have on property which belonged to Her Majesty? Is it not humiliation on the part of a British colony to subordinate itself thus to a foreign power which has really no jurisdiction in the matter—and to give over to that power for irresponsible disbursement any portion of her public funds? Why should Britain become trustee to the Pope, holding in trust the proceeds of a sale of lands, forfeited to herself long ago, and now made by this complained of litigation subject to the Pope's disposal? *The Pope requires the proceeds of the sale to be held for him*, and yet the act declares that he has no legal right to any portion of said proceeds, and that "the offer of \$400,000 is not made in substitution or satisfaction of the proceeds of sale!"

## A DILEMMA.

Either the Pope has a right to the proceeds—or he has not? If he has, why affirm so positively that there is no legal liability. If he has not, why, on the footing of a mere moral claim, concede to him so unlimited a power? Does not this give to the Sovereign Pontiff now a *quasi* legal claim, (hitherto confessedly wanting) of which vigorous use will doubtless yet be made in after applications. But the other day, in the Court of Chancery at Toronto, in the matter of an International Bridge Company, (a most innocent arrangement in which there seemed no risk of clashing) each county having assented to the corporation created by it, uniting with the corporation created by the other, and bringing into the union the rights and liabilities, conferred and imposed upon it, the Vice-Chancellor declared: "Were the Canadian Parliament to endeavour to do so, to say that Canadian subjects and Canadian corporations are to be subject to legislation that might be passed by Congress, it would, I apprehend, be unconstitutional; it would be authorizing a foreign power to legislate for its subjects, an abdication of sovereignty inconsistent with its relation to the Empire of which it forms a part." With greater force of propriety may this language be applied to the Quebec Act against which we protest—for what does it amount to?—Just this, as a distinguished legal authority puts it,—"The Government, recognizing the property as belonging to Her Majesty, and forming part of the Crown Lands of the Province, have asked, received and acted on the permission of a foreigner to deal with them; and, further, they have placed at the disposal of the same foreigner, \$400,000 of the public moneys; or, in other words, while the expenditure of public

funds should be directed by those constitutional methods which every faithful government is bound to observe, the legislature has abdicated its functions in favor of the Pope, and has unconstitutionally committed to His Holiness, the disposition and distribution of nearly half a million in the province." Recall to your remembrance such portions of the Act as these.

1. That "the Holy Father reserves to himself the right of settling the question of the Jesuit Estates in Canada."

2. That the proceeds of sales are to be disposed of "with the sanction of the Holy See."

3. That the agreement with the government is to be "binding only, in so far as it shall be ratified by the Pope." and

4. That the amount of the compensation fixed (\$400,000) shall remain "in the hands of the government of the Province, as a special deposit, until the Pope has ratified the said settlement and made known his wishes respecting the distribution of such amount, in this country."

#### AN ABDICATION OF SOVEREIGNTY.

Does the law permit the Crown, its ministers or subjects, or any colonial legislature to grant or delegate any such authority to any foreign power? We trow not. This indeed is an abdication of sovereignty inconsistent with "our relation to the empire of which we form a part." The Pope might have objected to the arrangement. What then? His veto would have prevented the Act coming into force. Against such Papal intervention we have protested from of old. Britain's stout resistance in this direction can be seen in Acts passed in the 25th, 27th, and 38th years of Edward III., and the 13th and 16th of Richard II. The statute 24, Henry VIII. ch. 12, prohibits "any foreign institutions, appeals, sentences, judgments, or any other process from the see of Rome, or any other courts or potentates," and prescribes penalties against "persons within the realm or, within any of the King's dominions, attempting to procure any such from the see of Rome, or from any foreign court or potentate."

#### PAPAL INTERVENTION REPUDIATED IN OLDEN TIME.

Any intervention, especially from the "See of Rome," the entire course of British legislation distinctly repudiated as "in derogation of the regality of our Lord the King." Another statute (still in force), embodies the protest of Parliament, "that the crown of England which hath been so free at all times, that it hath been in no earthly subjection, but immediately subject to God, and none other, in all things touching the regality of the same crown should be submitted to the Pope," and yet another (Henry VIII., ch. 21), expressly prohibits the Sovereign from "procuring licenses, delegations &c., or any instrument in writing from the Bishop of Rome, called the Pope."

These statutes, says Lord Coke, are

declaratory of the ancient or common law of the realm (Coke's Instit. 34), and they declare that every encouragement or acknowledgement of the papal or a foreign power within the realm, "is a diminution of the regal authority of the Crown, and is an offence." (4 Bl. com. 110). Surely the phraseology of this Jesuit Act, already repeatedly quoted by us, in which the Pope so distinctly claims the right to settle this matter, and which forbids its coming into force without his permission, is an "acknowledgment of the Papal power within the realm"—an acknowledgment all the more unmistakable, as it actually requires in order to its enforcement, an "instrument in writing from the Bishop of Rome called the Pope," in direct violation of the prohibition already cited (from Henry VIII., ch. 21), an "instrument in writing without the granting of which the law would be of none effect."

#### PAPAL INTERFERENCE REPUDIATED IN LEADING R. C. COUNTRIES.

While the Roman Catholics of France and Italy have utterly excluded the ecclesiastical power from the civil domain, this Act does really bring His Holiness into that domain, as one having no small measure of authority in Canada. Be it remembered also that the government of the province of Quebec includes the Queen as its sovereign and head. When the Lieut.-Governor signs this act, he does so in the name and by authority of the Queen:—when the Governor-General-in-Council assents, or declines disallowing, he does so in the same name and by the same authority, thus subjecting her Majesty to the indignity of asking permission from the Pope to give validity and force to her own legislation. Is it right, is it constitutional, in view of the long course of British enactments to which we have referred, that our beloved sovereign should be so used. If permitted in this case, and the precedent so established be allowed to go unquestioned, will it not be taken advantage of, in the future in other cases where Romish interests are supposed to be involved? It has been said that this is meant to be merely a receipt in full from the Head of the Roman Catholic Church—for the money received, and to prevent the making of after demands, but

1. The language of the statute does not bear this out. The expressions quoted cover much more than this.

2. Far from stopping after applications, it will tend to stimulate them, because it gives a quasi legal claim, in circumstances where the very statute itself declares there is only a moral one.

Hints are already given that this may be looked upon only as an instalment as two million dollars are claimed as due. Money is already asked for in other ways, and a valuable piece of land (Laprairie common) which the act cedes. And that it will not stop here, may be gathered from the letter to the Quebec premier from

the Jesuits, 1888, who fathers, and if they anticipate the institution, in The me interpre in a lead 6th: 'tasted b

Quebec stubborn of room and a I make us annual order th

Even receive in this n and lib they ne severest are of th

3. It Head of quite a the chu the Prop posing th were co General Church tendent Chairm unions keenest cedent, civil an the Cler stratum admitte there is conditic was arro

Indee asserted with ev tween c still co passed which t give ad has eve issue in

JES III. Estates' Jesuits. mystery our Dor which n the utm out of th

the Jesuit procurator of date May 20th, 1888, who suggests that now "the Jesuit fathers in accordance with their deserts, and if they ask for it, be allowed to participate in the grants which the government of this province allows to other institutions to encourage teaching, education, industries, arts and colonization." The meaning is plain. Principal Grant interprets it thus in a letter which appeared in a leading Toronto journal of date March 6th: "The order (i. e. of Jesuits) has tasted blood and wants more already."

#### IT WILL BLEED QUEBEC WHITE.

Quebec cannot be expected to resist very stubbornly when, at any time, the story of room No. 8, can be repeated at Ottawa, and a Dominion government forced to make us all pay in one shape or another for annual largesses already expected by an order that never learns and never forgets."

Even his Roman Catholic friends will receive with respect what Dr. Grant says in this matter, for he has ever acted kindly and liberally towards them, and indeed they need not feel sensitive as to the severest strictures, for many of themselves are of the same mind.

3. It is also to be considered that the Head of the Roman Catholic church claims quite a different relation to the world and the church from the recognized heads of the Protestant churches. But, even supposing that the claim embodied in this act, were conceded to the Moderator of our General Assembly the Metropolitan of the Church of England, the general Superintendents of the Methodist church, or the Chairmen of the Baptist or Congregational unions; we would be among the first and keenest to oppose it as a dangerous precedent, and disastrous to the interests of civil and religious liberty. Underlying the Clergy reserve act was the solid substratum of a legal claim, while here, it is admitted by the framers of this measure, there is none. But, in that case, no such conditions were specified, no such authority was arrogated or acted on.

#### NO STATE CONNEXION.

Indeed, the very preamble of that act asserted the desirableness of doing away with even the semblance of a connexion between church and state, a connexion which still continues in the province that has passed this obnoxious act, a connexion to which this act seemed at first calculated to give additional vigor and vitality, but which has evoked a spirit which may eventually issue in its utter abolition.

#### JESUITISM A MYSTERY OF INIQUITY.

II. I am opposed to the Jesuit Estates' Act because we are opposed to the Jesuits. We regard Jesuitism as the very mystery of iniquity which already works in our Dominion to its serious detriment, and which needs not additional latitude, but the utmost abridgement "till it be taken out of the way."

In speaking against this system which is evil, only evil and that continually, we have the most intelligent and influential Roman Catholics who agree with us thoroughly. They have no more sympathy with it than we have. To them as to us, it is a "doctrine of devils," on which they indignantly frown as we do. Its principles they repudiate. Its practices they loathe. Our contention to-night is not against Roman Catholics, not a few of whom we esteem and admire, but against a system, which, with "all deceivableness of unrighteousness" works harm and loss to them as well as to us.

Indeed, did we wish ill to Roman Catholics, we would wish the Jesuits to obtain the ascendancy amongst them as they are now fast doing. They have ever been as the camel which got its head into the desert tent eventually to cuss the rightful occupant, or, as the frozen adder which the unsuspecting peasant one cold day took up into his bosom, warming it into life and activity till it stung the generous bosom from which its warmth and nutriment were derived.

#### BANISHED FROM FRANCE, 1761.

Thus in France these evil men and seducers waxed worse and worse till, in 1761, it decreed their banishment from the kingdom. By several decrees of that parliament, it was enacted that the books published by the Jesuits be examined carefully and attested by commissioners so as to justify the abolition of the order. These were collated and published in a quarto volume, in Latin and French, with the parliamentary decree of March 5th, 1762, accompanying them which, after a preamble continued thus.

#### JESUITS CONDEMNED BY ROMANISTS.

"The subject having been duly investigated and discussed, the parliament, all the chambers being assembled, have decreed and ordained that the aforesaid extracts verified and collated by the commissioners, and the translation of them shall be annexed to the "process verbal" of this day, and that the Attorney-General shall be directed to send without delay, the said assertions to all the prelates, that they may adopt all necessary measures upon this important affair. The parliament also enjoins upon their president to present to the king a faithful copy of the said passages; that the king may know the mischievous doctrines which are maintained without interruption by the priests, students and other members of the order of the Jesuits in a multitude of works often printed, in public theses, and in lectures dictated to youth from the first organization of that society until this time, with the approbation of their theologians, the permission of their superiors and generals, and the eulogy of the other members of the said order; doctrines which, in their consequences, destroy the law of nature that

rule of morals which God has Himself inscribed upon the heart of man. Their dogmas also break all the bonds of civil society by authorizing theft, falsehood, perjury, the most inordinate and criminal impurities, and generally, all passions and wickedness; by teaching the nefarious principles of secret compensation, equivocation, mental reservation, probabilism and philosophical sins; by extirpating every sentiment of humanity among mankind in their sanction of homicide and parricide; by subverting the authority of governments, and the principles of subordination and obedience; by inculcating regicide among faithful subjects, and in fine by subverting the foundations and practice of religion, and substituting all sorts of superstitions with magic, blasphemy, irreligion and idolatry. The king is also requested to consider the dreadful results of those pernicious instructions, especially when combined with the other abominations which the rules and constitutions of the said Jesuits prescribe respecting the choice and entire uniformity of sentiments and opinions throughout the said society." The volume is divided into 18 chapters and contains extracts from 1500 different authors whose writings stretched over 171 years from 1590 to 1761. This formidable indictment was drawn up and passed, not by fanatical, bigoted Protestants, but by a parliament of orthodox Romanists who bore with the Jesuits till they could do so no longer, and "grown weary of the load. They shook, their encumbered lap, and cast them out." The ecclesiastical united with the civil authorities of France in proclaiming that the "society was dangerous to the Christian faith, disturbers of the peace and more fitted to corrupt than to edify."

#### THEIR NUMBER WHEN ABOLISHED.

When suppressed by Ganganelli (Pope Clement XIV.) in 1773, they numbered 22,787, of whom 11,010 were priests; they had 61 institutions for novices, i. e., Jesuits of the 1st class; 669 colleges for scholars or Jesuits of the 2nd class; 176 seminaries for coadjutors, Jesuits of the 3rd class, and 24 houses for the professed, the highest and finished class of the order. The authors approved by the Jesuits who have written in the outrageous manner indicated so as to inspire the indignation of good Roman Catholics numbered 326; 50 upon probable opinions; 33 on invincible ignorance and an erroneous conscience; 14 on simony; 7 on blasphemy and sacrilege; 35 on irreligion; 17 on immodesty; 28 on perjury and false witness; 5 on prevarication of judges; 33 on theft, secret compensation and concealment of property; 36 on homicide, and 68 on treason.

#### UNIVERSAL CONDEMNATION.

These dangerous publications, many of which have been re-published and received the highest endorsement in these last days, have been condemned at different times by

40 universities; 100 prelates; 3 provincial synods; 7 general assemblies, and 48 decrees, briefs, letters apostolic and papal bulls from Rome, so that when we cry aloud and spare not against the revival of Jesuitism and its endowment out of the public Purse, amongst ourselves, we are in line with a long catalogue of the loftiest dignitaries of the Church of Rome who vexed their righteous souls from day to day with their ungodly deeds, and who, by all the modes of protest available, testified that they would have no fellowship with such unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.

#### BY THEIR FRUITS SHALL YE KNOW THEM.

The Jesuits had to do with the assassination of Henry III. and Henry IV. of France, the Spanish Armada, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the Gunpowder Plot, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and some of the bloodiest pages in the Book of Time for two centuries. For their high crimes and misdemeanors, prior to the abolition of the order in 1773, they were expelled thirty-nine times from all the countries of Europe, as well as the regions beyond.

#### THE BILL WILL HURT POPEERY.

In many respects nothing would subvert the interests of Protestantism better, and be more injurious to Roman Catholicism in the end, than the patronizing of this order. We saw its working in Boston lately, where through Jesuit intrigue the enthusiasm of the friends of liberty was evoked to such a pitch that a Roman Catholic mayor, who had gone in by a three thousand majority, found himself in a minority of the same figure, and an almost clean sweep made of any office holders that were suspected of the least sympathy with the intriguers. History has so fully shown in former as well as later times that the Jesuit, however polite and plausible in his manners, is certain, wherever he can get a favorable opportunity, to reveal his innate character, that he inspires among enlightened Romanists, and even the most liberal Protestants a wholesome dread.

We have already referred to our former honored citizen and friend, the distinguished Principal of Queen's University. Who lived on a better footing with Roman Catholics in this community than he, the fast friend of the late liberal-minded Archbishop Connolly, and the sworn foe of bigotry of every sort, but, in that same letter already quoted, he depicts the Jesuits in colors as dark and forbidding as any, and suggests an effort to revoke the act of incorporation granted them two years ago, adding the remark: "Possibly some of our Roman Catholic friends may think that I am now writing rather strongly. I work in the common interest. Before they condemn me, let them condemn the long line of Popes quoted by Clement XIV.,—namely, Popes Urban VII., Clement IX., Clement X., Clement XI., Clement XII., Alex. VII., Alex. VIII., Innocent X., Innocent XI., Innocent XII., Innocent XIII., and Benedict XIII. The abolisher of the order, (Clement XIV.), declares, "our predecessors had to undergo much vexation on that account. Indeed, Pope Innocent XI. driven by necessity, went so far as to forbid the Society to receive and invest novices. Further, Innocent

XIII. w  
the same  
Clement  
the Soci  
possible  
true and  
would  
smooth  
excrete  
the thir  
ously co  
tices of  
it was  
the high  
Dominio  
the rene  
detested  
Pope C  
declared  
and of o  
herby a  
the Jesu  
suppress  
not for  
infallibi  
was over  
vived by

What  
half of  
there be  
pensation  
by the c  
gation?  
we shall  
to "foot  
suggests  
be) for  
or anct  
pected  
never fo  
our cos  
Quebec  
that, in  
ment th  
work.

Unde  
between  
to 1867,  
confeder  
Ontario  
But if i  
ance ar  
be exp  
more, y  
tension  
other u

This  
Though  
questio  
It puts  
on a n  
It is a  
soverei  
depend  
The  
ringing  
mense  
whom  
our Ro  
like to  
tending  
citizens  
no cour

XIII. was compelled to threaten them with the same punishment, &c., &c. The historic Clement closes the famous brief suppressing the Society, with the sentence: It is scarcely possible as long as it exists, to re-establish true and amiable peace in the church." It would be well for those who "prophecy smooth things" concerning this universally execrated Society, to settle the matter with the thirteen illustrious Popes, who so grievously complained of the principles and practices of the Jesuits, and to explain wherefore it was that, so lately Cardinal Taschereau, the highest Roman Catholic dignitary in the Dominion, through his representative, resisted the renewal of this long defunct and much detested order—and wherefore the infallible Pope Clement in his Bull of abolition, declared: "After mature deliberation, and of our own knowledge of the order, we hereby and herewith declare and decree that the Jesuit order be absolutely and for ever suppressed, to all eternity." It is for others, not for us, to harmonize with the dogma of infallibility, the fact that the defunct order was over 40 years afterwards, in (1814), revived by another Papal Bull.

#### NO MORAL CLAIM.

What 'moral claim' can be preferred in behalf of so immoral an organization, and how can there be any moral obligation to make compensation for property, duly and lawfully taken by the crown to the extinction of all civil obligation? In all probability, too, in the long run we shall have, to a very considerable extent, to "foot the bill." At all events, as Dr. Grant suggests, the "Dominion government (will be) forced to make us all pay, in one shape or another for annual largesses already expected by an order that never learns and never forgets." And thus we shall find to our cost, that although, in a sense this is Quebec business, it is ours yet more, and that, in a variety of ways, to our sore detriment this mystery of iniquity doth already work.

Under the legislative union which existed between Upper and Lower Canada from 1840 to 1867, this was the principal trouble, and confederation was sought by what is now Ontario, in order, if possible, to get rid of it. But if it fails in this respect, if the old annoyance arising out of clerical interference, is to be experienced in an aggravated form—once more, you can easily see how there may be a tension to the point of snapping and some other means of relief may be sought.

#### NOT A QUEBEC MATTER ONLY.

This is no mere local or provincial question. Though nominally a Quebec matter, it raises questions which affect the entire Dominion. It puts the very existence of the Dominion on a needless and most undesirable strain. It is also a slight offered to our much-loved sovereign, making her action in this matter dependent on a foreign power.

The Rev. D. J. Macdonnell, in moving a ringing resolution recently at an immense meeting in Toronto, said: "With whom are we contending? Not with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. I would like to emphasize this. We are not contending with our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, but with a band of ecclesiastics, of no country and of no home, with a band of

men who have no flag, for which they care, who have no altars, for which to fight, whose only object is the assault of freedom, civil and religious, wherever they find it; whose only aim is to bring their fellow men under their tyranny for the satisfying of their insatiable ambition. If I know myself I am not a bigot. If there is any one element that has been left out in my make up, it is the element of bigotry."

"But when men come, and in the name of religion trample on my civil rights, and when, in the name of freedom, they crush out freedom, asking for tolerance, in order that they may use the most exceeding intolerance all the world over; when men come in the name of Jesus, and make conspiracy against all the dearest rights of man; then, I say, it is no longer bigotry, but the simple duty of every Christian and of every citizen to protest, and you are citizens, and we are here, too, in the capacity of citizens who wish to preserve what is best for ourselves and our children. We are here to protest against and condemn the Jesuit Estates' Act, and the incorporation of the Order, too, which was the thin edge of the wedge. It was put in long ago, when you and I were asleep, and it has been driven so far in the good stout timber of Confederation that it has nearly split—and what you and I have to do is to loosen the wedge, so that that good old timber may be kept whole. Some people may say that this is locking the stable door after the horse is stolen, but I tell you it is not stolen yet—the horse of British freedom. This has not been stolen, although they have very impudently opened the stable door. It is not too late, and so we are here to protest, and I hope we are going to do something else than protest."

#### STRUGGLE ONLY BEGUN.

Surely this struggle which has been precipitated through the avarice and ambition of this crafty foe of our country's peace and prosperity, cannot cease till not merely the act now complained of—be revoked, but the previous one giving corporate existence to this anti-British order, passed in opposition to British law, and everything wearing the semblance of an Established church, or the endowment of sectarian institutions, be erased from our statute book. If we allow this mystery of iniquity which already works—in our Dominion, to keep working—giving "aid and comfort to the enemy," instead of simple toleration as the law allows, we shall find it true of our country, what Clement XIV. affirmed of the existence of this order in his church. "It is scarcely possible as long as it exists to re-establish true and durable peace." It may be deemed Cassandra prophesying, but unless all history is a lie, and the testimonies of the most trustworthy in the Roman Catholic church be gratuitous slanders, this "mystery of iniquity" in our Dominion will work as the horse surreptitiously brought into the Troy of classic story, or the sowing of the teeth of the fabled dragon to be followed by a bristling harvest of armed men. We would be as anxious as any to preserve the autonomy of the several provinces, but has any province the right to alienate funds from the purpose, for which they were appropriated, and to divide them

among a variety of parties, not contemplated in the original trusteeship. Has any province the right to endow at pleasure sects and parties, and to apply to objects ecclesiastical what was designed exclusively for objects educational. Have provinces the right to establish and endow religious orders that are forbidden by British law, and to make the supremacy of the Queen, be subordinate in civil matters to any ecclesiastical dignitary, and her legislation subject to the consent of foreign powers. Are not these and such like beyond the provincial jurisdiction, and warranting the intervention of the confederated provinces, or even a direct appeal to the Queen or the privy council, in which direction in all probability, the whole matter will be taken. Under confederation the interests of all the provinces are inseparably connected. In matters of much inferior moment, e. g., the streams and timber limits, matters of boundary and finance, such disallowance has been exercised, and such appeals have been made. We hold it to be the duty of all good citizens, irrespective of creed, to oppose measures which seriously threaten the peace and perpetuity of the Dominion, and to use all legitimate means of preventing such legislation from being finally sustained.

Let us concede the power claimed by the Pope in this act, and we may be by and bye, under the operation of the Papal Syllabus, (the Magna Charta of modern ultra-montanism), whose 77th, 78th and 79th articles, "condemn those who refuse to the Romish church exclusive recognition as the state religion," "denounce all who permit to foreigners residing in Catholic countries, the public exercise of their own worship and doctrine," and declare that "civil liberty of every mode of worship corrupts the morals of the people."

If the power conceded to the Pope in this "Act" and which the Minister of Justice contended was vested in him, not in the Province of Quebec merely, but in every part of the Dominion, be admitted, then within a certain sphere he takes precedence of all authority and power, "civil or ecclesiastical," and the recent utterances of the ultra-montanes of the Province of Quebec, which now provoke a smile of credulity, may prove a reality, as when Father Braun preaches that Protestantism has no rights, it is no religion," and Mr. Binan insists that the Catholic church alone has the right to liberty, and that "only where it is impossible to do otherwise, may liberty of worship be tolerated," and Abbe Pâquet instructs the students of Laval University, (which is comparatively liberal) "that those who reproach the church with being intolerant, reproach her with nothing less than her right of existence," and assures them that when the State "allows civil liberty of worship it usurps a right which belongs to the spiritual power."

Tenely submitt to the "Jesuit Act"—and we shall discover the truth of what the Vicar General of Montreal, stated upon oath,—that "the Church regards as those over whom she can exercise jurisdiction all persons who have been baptized," and that the oath of supremacy passed in the first year of Queen Elizabeth, and still binding on all government officials, and which the last Lieut. Governor of Quebec took under

protest, is made of none effect, that true Protestant oath, the result of a bitter experience of Papal misrule, which declares that no "foreign Prince, person, prelate, State or potentate hath or has a right to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm." The position we have contended for, is vigorously maintained by some of the calmest and most comprehensive thinkers in the Dominion, such as our own Principal Caven, whose mind is eminently judicial, and who is at the very antipodes of the fiery fanatic. On the same platform, meet and move in the matter, distinguished brethren, politically and ecclesiastically opposed. We have been much impressed with the statements of Sir Alexander Gait, well-known here, when in 1877 he presided so successfully over the Fisheries' Commission—a man now long removed from the exciting arena of party politics, and like Dr. Caven, thoroughly judicious and, statesman like. Writing some time ago in a tractate on "Church and State," he shows, in the complicated condition of parties within our Dominion, what a safety valve is the veto power vested in the Cabinet. When a question is unmistakably *ultra vires* (beyond the power) of the Provincial authorities, the intervention of that power is not so necessary, for the Judicial courts, can then determine it. It is with matters of "doubtful disputation," or which may be *intra vires*, (within the power) of a Province, but objectionable and likely to work injuriously to a minority in that Province, or the general peace and prosperity of the Dominion. "We have, says he, the guarantee that all local legislation is subject to revision and veto by the Governor-General, or rather by the Federal Government."

It is as if Sir Alexander foreshadowed so long ago the scene enacted on the floor of our Parliament when 188 opposed the employment of the veto at this most critical emergency, and but 13 desired it, giving by anticipation the rationale of that otherwise unaccountable vote, where he goes on to say.

"If no voice of warning be raised, and nothing can be heard but adulatory paeans to the hierarchy to obtain their political support and influence, how can we expect to receive attention when we appeal to a government at Ottawa, almost all of whose supporters from Quebec owe their seats to the clergy, and of whose opponents a like proportion are also hopelessly entangled." The chivalrous knight of Montreal, himself the embodiment of courtesy and charity, is not "mad" as those badly abused "clerical agitators," who now wisely sound the note of needed warning are counted, but "speaks (as they do), the words of truth and soberness," when he goes on to say,—(and it is the best justification of the present movement, for which, not they, but their traducers are wholly responsible.) "The veto by the Federal Government is the real palladium of Protestant liberties in Lower Canada. \* \* \* The educational rights of the people of that Province are only safe under its shelter. \* \* \* Their representation guarantee will some day dissolve into thin air without its exercise. \* \* \* It is in the firm but moderate use of this vast power that safety may yet be found from undue encroachments to which both Protestants and Catholics are exposed."

that true  
er exper-  
ares that  
State or  
have any  
eminence  
al, within  
contended  
ne of the  
thinkers in  
Principal  
judicial,  
the fiery  
meet and  
brethren,  
opposed.  
the state-  
ell-known  
ccessfully  
man now  
a of party  
horoughly  
Writing  
" Church  
mplicated  
Dominion,  
er vested  
is unmis-  
ver) of the  
ention of  
e Judicial  
t is with  
or which  
ower) of a  
likely to  
that Pro-  
sperity of  
s he, the  
is subject  
r-General,  
ent."

adowed so  
door of our  
mployment  
mergency,  
nticipation  
ccountable

, and noth-  
ans to the  
upport and  
receive at-  
ernment at  
rters from  
gy, and of  
n are also  
ous knight  
diment of  
l" as those  
' who now  
arning are  
, the words  
goes on to  
tion of the  
t they, but  
ible.) "The  
is the real  
in Lower  
ights of the  
a's under  
resentation  
into thin  
\* It is in  
vast power  
rom undue  
stants and